

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated January 4, 2011, which Official Action the Examiner has designated as being FINAL, and also the subsequent Advisory Action dated 22 April 2011 in the above-identified application, Applicants respectfully submit this Amendment Accompanying Request for Continued Examination for entry prior to the further consideration of this application on its substantive merits.

Claims 15 – 36 were pending at the time that the currently outstanding FINAL Official Action was issued. Applicants did not request any further substantive amendment of the pending claims of this application by their Request for Reconsideration After Final Rejection Under 37 CFR 1.116. However, in this Amendment Accompanying Request for Continued Examination, Applicants have amended Claims 15-18, 23, 26-29 and 34. No claims are cancelled, added or withdrawn by this Amendment. Therefore, upon the entry of the foregoing Amendment Claims 15-36 as hereinabove amended will constitute the claims under active prosecution in the above-identified application. Also, pursuant to the Rules, the foregoing Amendment reproduces the currently pending claims with the inclusion of appropriate status identifiers and indications of the changes being made.

The Examiner has maintained the outstanding rejection of Claims 15-36 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by the Murata reference (JP 10-150608) cited in the present specification and in Applicants' Information Disclosure Statement over Applicant's traversal of that rejection.

By the foregoing Amendment, Applicant has amended the final paragraphs of Claims 15-18, 23, 26-29 and 34 as follows:

Regarding Claims 15-18 and 26-29:

“wherein the decision portion ... determines that the first amount of parallax needs to be changed only when the first pitch between dots is greater than the standard pitch between dots.”

Regarding Claims 23 and 34:

“wherein only when a first amount of parallax on the first display portion after the three-dimensional image data has been displayed will be greater than the standard amount of parallax, the decision portion determines that the image size needs to be changed.”

This is in response to the comment made by the Examiner in the second item of the Advisory Action, wherein it is stated that: *“Second, the claims do not preclude making an adjustment when pitch between dots of the receiver is less than the pitch between dots on the sender side.”*

More specifically, in order to preclude making an adjustment when the pitch between dots of the receiver is less than the pitch between dots on the sender side, the claims have been amended hereinabove so as to include language precluding that result.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submit that it now will be seen that in the Murata reference the parallax adjustment is always performed based upon the magnification Z ([0064] – [0067]). To the contrary, however, in the present invention, the parallax

adjustment is performed only when the pitch between dots of the receiver side is greater than the pitch between dots on the sender side.

Accordingly, as previously emphasized, the criterion for determining whether the parallax adjustment is performed or not is different between the Murata reference and the present invention.

Therefore, given the above clarification of the wording of the claims, it is Applicants' belief that the argument presented previously concerning the Murata reference is both relevant and determinative of the patentability of this application. That is, Murata is similar to the present invention in that when the received 3D stenography signal is displayed by the three-dimensional display equipment, **the parallax amount** of the 3D stenography (image) signal **is made to change** (see paragraph [0067] of the Murata reference). However, Applicants respectfully submit that the method for adjusting the parallax amount of the 3D image of the Murata reference is completely different from that of the present invention.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that it will be clear to the Examiner upon reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendment that in the Murata reference the parallax amount of the 3D image signal is adjusted **based on the magnification Z between the display size DS2** of the broadcasting station (sender) side and **the display size DS1** of the user (receiver) side (see paragraphs [0064] and [0067] of the Murata reference).

On the other hand, Applicants also respectfully submit that it will be clear to the Examiner upon reconsideration that in the present invention, the parallax amount of the 3D image signal is adjusted when **the pitch between dots of the image side is greater than the pitch between dots on the sender side.**

Since the Examiner in the currently outstanding FINAL Official Action indicates that "...wherein the decision portion compares a first pitch between dots using the first display size and the first resolution (implicit in the display size) and a standard pitch between dots determined using the standard display size and the standard resolution...", it appears to Applicants that the Examiner is identifying the "display size" of Murata as the claimed "pitch between dots". However, although both of the "display size" and the "pitch between dots" are elements of the display device, they nevertheless are separate from one another. For example, there is the case that two display devices having the same "display size" have different "pitches between dots". In the same way, there also is the case that two display devices having the same "pitch between dots" have different "display sizes".

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the parallax adjusting method using "display size" of the Murata reference is different from the parallax adjusting method using "pitch between dots" of the present claims. In other words, the parameter utilized in the parallax adjustment is different as between the Murata reference and the present invention.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully call attention to the fact that in the Murata reference the parallax adjustment is always performed based upon the magnification Z (see Murata at paragraphs [0064] to [0067]). The present invention, however, is to the contrary in that the parallax adjustment is performed when the pitch between dots of the receiver side is greater than the pitch between dots of the sender side. In other words, the criteria for determining whether the parallax adjustment is to be performed or not is different as between the Murata reference and the present invention.

Accordingly, in view of the foregoing Remarks, Applicants respectfully again submit that the Examiner will understand upon reconsideration that the Murata reference and the present invention are clearly distinct from one another such that the Murata reference does not teach, disclose or suggest all of the elements of the present invention cooperating with one another in the manner of the present invention as required in order to support an anticipation rejection. Consequently, reconsideration and allowance of this application in response to this submission is respectfully requested.

Applicants also believe that additional fees beyond those submitted herewith are not required in connection with the consideration of this Amendment Accompanying Request for Reconsideration (RCE). However, if for any reason a fee is required, a fee paid is inadequate or credit is owed for any excess fee paid, you are hereby authorized and requested to charge and/or credit Deposit Account No. 04-1105, as necessary, for the correct payment of all fees which may be due in connection with the filing and consideration of this communication.

Dated: May 31, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

By David A. Tucker

David A. Tucker

Registration No.: 27,840

EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE
LLP

Customer No. 21874

P.O. Box 55874

Boston, Massachusetts 02205

(617) 517-5508

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant